

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claim 1 is independent.

The examiner uses Heckerman to reject claims 1-10 and 12-14 as having been anticipated.

Claim 1, as amended for clarification, recites "on a graphical user interface (GUI), providing a plurality of questions on the web page, the questions free of requiring a user to explicitly weight the importance of the user's responses relative to their corresponding questions."

Heckerman neither describes nor suggests this quoted claim feature. On the contrary, Heckerman forces a user to weight importance relative to questions:

In using the browser, the user initially inputs an indication of their like or dislike for various features of the products *as well as an indication of how strongly they feel about the like or dislike*. (emphasis added) (See Abstract).

This is the opposite of applicant's claimed invention. Applicant's invention provides a method for interactively providing unbiased information on a web page so the user can make the most well-informed response to each of the questions. Unbiased is impartial, without bias or prejudice. Heckerman discloses exactly what applicant's claimed invention seeks to overcome, i.e., to avoid constraining an online user to a single product source and to avoid forcing a consumer to explicitly weight importance of various feature selections.

As described in a previous reply and in applicant's detailed description, unbiased information refers to the data dynamically presented to the system user in reaction to a question response, whether that response be an option selection event or data input. This information provides education and consideration data pertaining to product attribute characteristics and/or

purchase decision conditions. The character of the information is unbiased inasmuch as it seeks to inform and educate the user so that the user may make an option selection that most closely aligns with his or her best interests as opposed to the interests of the institution selling the product(s) to the user. The effect of this dynamic presentation of unbiased education and information is the potential revision of the user's initial response so that it best represents the user's best interests, which in turn, modifies the overall record of the user's interactions within the purchase decision process that serves as the data source for the system's product recommendation(s).

Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Heckerman.

The examiner uses Heckerman to reject claims 11 and 15 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 is not obvious in light of Heckerman. Claim 1, as described above, recites "on a graphical user interface (GUI), providing a plurality of questions on the web page, the questions free of requiring a user to explicitly weight the importance of the user's responses relative to their corresponding questions." Heckerman does not teach or suggest this claim feature.

One skilled in this art would not be led to Heckerman to provide on a graphical user interface (GUI), providing a plurality of questions on the web page, the questions free of requiring a user to explicitly weight the importance of the user's responses relative to their corresponding questions because Heckerman teaches questions requiring a user to explicitly weight importance relative to the questions. No combination of Heckerman and common knowledge can thus teach or suggest applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, claim 1 is not obvious in light of Heckerman.

Claims 11 and 15 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claim 1. Accordingly, claims 11 and 15 are not obvious in view of Heckerman.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 23, 2005



Kenneth F. Kozik  
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906